

# The North Carolina Standard.

THOMAS LORING,  
Editor and Proprietor.

THE CONSTITUTION AND THE UNION OF THE STATES.....THEY "MUST BE PRESERVED."

RALEIGH, N. C. WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 9, 1837.

VOL. III.....NO. 145.  
Three Dollars per Annum.

## TERMS.

THE STANDARD is published weekly, at three dollars per annum—payable half-yearly in advance; but it will be necessary for those living at a distance, or out of the State, to pay an entire year in advance. A subscriber failing to give notice of his desire to discontinue at the expiration of the period for which he may have paid, will be considered as having subscribed anew, and the paper continued, at the option of the Editor, until ordered to be stopped; but no paper will be discontinued, until all arrearages are paid.

## ADVERTISEMENTS.

Not exceeding sixteen lines, will be inserted one time for one dollar; and, twenty-five cents for each subsequent insertion; those of greater length in proportion. If the number of insertions be not marked on them, they will be continued until ordered out.

COURT ADVERTISEMENTS, and Sheriffs' Sales will be charged 25 per cent. higher than the usual rates.

A deduction of 33-1-3 per cent. will be made to those who advertise by the year.

Letters to the Editor must come free of postage, or they may not be attended to.

## AN ADDRESS

### ON THE CONGRESSIONAL ELECTION.

#### To the People of WAKE:

WE know it is not customary for those who are not candidates to address the people in this form. But these are extraordinary times. The leaders of the Bank party in Wake County, have resorted to the unusual expedient of meeting together for the nomination of a party candidate for Congress, and have heaped abuse on the administrations of General Jackson and Mr. Van Buren and their supporters, and they cannot complain because we come forward to defend ourselves, our principles, and the rights of the people, against their machinations. We are plain men, but there is cause to thank God, that this contest between the rights of the people on one side, and the arrogant claims of a money corporation on the other, needs no great learning to understand it. All that we shall attempt is (in obedience to the appointment of our neighbors,) to lay a few plain facts before you, to repel the attacks of those who have violently assailed the administration of our country. We have no inducements to wage war against Mr. Graham—we are determined to respect the man, whilst we resolutely oppose his election. How far this course has been pursued by the other side, is left to your determination, with the single remark, that men seldom rave when they are right.

The important question in the pending election to Congress, is "Bank or no Bank?" The existence of a National Bank will be dangerous to public liberty. Its influence is over-powering. And the violence of its advocates, in itself, shews that the rights of the people will be overshadowed by it, if in an evil hour they suffer the establishment of such an institution. Mark the influences of this Bank Interest! No sooner does one of our neighbors turn a Bank-whig, than his whole nature becomes transformed—the courtesies and charities of life are frequently sacrificed in blind idolatry to the Bank, and he deals out curses and insults to the friends of the administration, as if he supposed the time had already arrived, when none but the followers of a Bank had any liberty left. Fellow Citizens, we speak the words of soberness, and you know we speak the language of truth.

Another proof of Bank influence! When General Jackson was first elected President, many supported him until he vetoed the Bank of the United States, who have been his bitter revilers ever since. This fact is known to you all. They even persecute him by the most unwarrantable abuse in his retirement to private life. Why is this? General Jackson is no longer President. Why wage this warfare against an honest and faithful servant of the people; one who if he is an enemy to the Bank, was a valiant foe to the enemies of America; who if he did vanquish the Bank at Philadelphia, was like triumphant over the British forces at New Orleans. Yes! Maledictions are habitually poured out upon the venerable head of a patriot soldier who shed his blood in defence of our liberty, because he is opposed to a Bank. Indeed this is strong evidence of Bank influence.

Unfortunately it is not all. When have the Bank party leaders in Congress taken sides with their own country? If they are right, our country is always in the wrong. When America had a dispute with France, they said the error was on our side. When Mexico and the United States were at points, Mexico was defended, and we were put in the wrong. Even in the Florida war, before the mangled bodies of butchered women and children had grown cold, the orators of this party were uttering reproaches against their own government, and shedding tears for the "poor Indians!" This is a strange state of things. It is most remarkable that they who are Bank leaders in Congress should uniformly condemn their own country. But it is not more strange than it is true. It is a most lamentable proof of Bank influence. We do not mean to charge corruption—we do not mean to say that our distinguished men were bribed—we refer to political influences only. And when that influence is powerful enough to warp the patriotism

even of honest public men, so far from this being a reason for forbearance, it only shews its tremendous force and more loudly calls on the People to beware of its growth.

So also when the Bank of the United States waged war against General Jackson; exerted all its powers to prostrate and dishonor the President, and alarmed the country by clamor and panic, because the President removed from its custody the money of the nation, with the leaders of this party the Bank was right—their government was always wrong. The Directors appointed by the Government to watch over the interests of the people were excluded from a knowledge of the Bank's proceedings—the Bank resorted to a foreign country to obtain a loan of millions to strengthen itself for a conflict with the people—it refused to submit to an investigation of its conduct by a Committee of Congress—it openly entered the field against the President and brought all its strength into the election—it was charged and seriously suspected of bribery to certain Editors of Newspapers in the large cities; and though all these wrongs of the Bank were overlooked or palliated, our venerable President was vilified and abused in the Senate for more than three months by the leaders of the Bank whig party, to the neglect of all public business, and finally censured by their vote. You all know that these things occurred in the memorable panic session. In our judgment, they are such evidences of the political influence of a Bank interest as should awaken the fears of every patriot.

Nor does this dangerous influence stop here. The Bank party lately professed to yield. They themselves declared "the bank is dead." Was this candid? Having once failed to vanquish the independent spirit of the people, they have but waited for a better opportunity to revive the contest. In a time of profound peace, and in the midst of unexampled prosperity, every Bank in the United States has stopped specie payment. An embarrassing and mischievous result is thus produced by the Banks themselves, and it is instantly seized upon by their party as a pretext for creating a National Bank in the country! We care not whether this was the effect of design or of mismanagement by the Banks. It is the same thing to the people. Their party, in truth, have only one cure to prescribe, and but one cause to assign for every evil. The administration of their own government has produced the evil. The Bank of the United States is to cure it! What?—Did General Jackson advise the Banks to lend more than they were able, and to stop specie payments? Did he not on the contrary warn us of the danger, and foreseeing that some such catastrophe must follow from over-banking and the extravagance of the times, did he not require the purchasers of public lands to pay for them in specie, so as to prevent their being bought up with the worthless notes of broken banks? And you are gravely told, it is wise to remedy the evils of too much banking and cure the ills of extravagance by a New Bank?—Would you make a drunken man sober by giving him more Brandy? Would you cure a poisoned patient by administering another dose of arsenic.

The influence of this Bank interest is further demonstrated by the arrogance with which its friends assert that the Government cannot get along without a Bank of the United States. Is this so? Then it is certain that the Government and the Bank must and will combine, for where the Bank cannot keep along without the Government and the Government cannot get along without the Bank, the Government and the Bank in mutual dependence, will league together. And here we warn you, against the delusion of being able to restrict the Bank. Can a Government that is dependent on a Bank, restrict it? True, you may prescribe limits in the charter, but if the Bank disregards them and substitutes its own will for the law of the land, a "Government which cannot get along without it" must yield, for to enforce the law will destroy the Bank, and the Bank being destroyed, the Government sinks with it.

Restrict a National Bank? Impose limits by a charter that will prevent it from doing mischief? Consult your common sense on the point. Either the talents of the Nation have not been able to devise the way for imposing such limits, or else they have not been faithfully exerted for the purpose, since it is certain that such an Institution has never been bound so as to destroy their power to act pretty much as they choose to do.

Look at the present condition of the Country. Every Bank in it is required by the law to pay specie and yet not one of them does it. If this plain duty is willfully disregarded by the Banks of inferior strength, who is to restrict a NATIONAL BANK?

Let your determination be made now in favor of the Bank, and it will never meet with difficulty in procuring a fresh charter. The power of the people, compared with that of the Bank, will hereafter, be as the strength of a child to the strength of a Giant. But you are told that Gen. Jackson and Mr. Van Buren have ruined the people, by putting down the Bank. And what is the remedy proposed. Why, to create an Institution whose power and influence may crush the people at plea-

sure, and take from them the Government of the Country. Estimating our patriotism by the Bank-rule of dollars and cents, they persuade us that the downfall of the Bank has produced a fall in the price of Cotton. This is not true.—Facts contradict the unfounded assertion.

In 1825, the price of Cotton was 26 dollars, but it suddenly fell down to 10 or 12 dollars. Then we had the Bank in its vigor, yet it did not keep up the price of Cotton.

If then, the Bank did not keep up the price of Cotton in 1825, how could it have done so in 1837? The price of Flour in 1825, was about 4 dollars, now it is worth 9 to 10 dollars a barrel. Will the Bank-men admit that the Bank kept down the price of Flour in 1825, and that it has risen to 10 dollars because there is no Bank of the United States? We have the same reason for the latter, as they have for the former opinion. The truth is, that the price of Cotton depends on the demand for it in foreign Countries, and the United States Bank had no more agency in decreasing the value of Cotton than its non-existence has in increasing the price of Flour or Corn. No means will be spared to mislead you and gain support to this powerful interest. Doubtless there are many among its supporters who are honest in their convictions and reasonable and fair in their manner of advancing it. But suffer us to inquire: Is this the course of their leaders?—Whose good name and reputation escapes their attack if he dares to oppose the Bank? What violence and rancor are shewn in their political contests? what fickleness in their professions? Do they not condemn one year that which they practice the next? Has it not been less than a year since you heard many of them denouncing the Baltimore Convention yet they are now advocating a Bank-Whig Convention, for the same purpose? Do they not one year vilify caucuses, and meet in caucus themselves the next year to start their candidates? Have they suffered the Country to enjoy any repose since their favorite Bank was vetoed?—Whilst they deprecate party spirit have they not madly pursued the conduct of partisans? Will you surrender to their violence? Are your liberties and the right of the people to control their own Government, worth nothing? Your reply to these questions is anticipated. Then let us go to the polls, and, unawed by the panic and pressure of Banks, unterrified by the violence of their party, vote like Freemen for protecting the rights of Freemen, and resist, whilst we may be able to do so, this dangerous and fatal Bank influence. Again let the motto of Republicans be "The People against the Bank."

ALLEN ROGERS, Senr.  
ANDREW HARTSFIELD,  
SETH JONES,  
DAVID OUTLAW, (of Wake)  
BENJ. MARRIOTT,  
BRYAN GREEN,  
BENJ. DUNN,  
CYRUS WHITAKER.

Committee, appointed to publish an Address, to the People of Wake, by a Meeting held at ROLESVILLE, July 21, 1837.

FROM THE DETROIT SPECTATOR.  
DANDYISM.

The worse indication in the character of any man is a love of dress. We have seen some persons, who would feel themselves highly insulted if called dandies—and would protest vehemently against such a charge who, nevertheless, were as anxious about the minutæ of dress, as the veriest coxcomb in existence. We maintain that no man can be intellectually great, who frets and fritters away his immortal mind upon such childish and effeminate frivolities. Think you WASHINGTON would ever have had the sparkling and dazzling halo of glory put upon his brow, if he had thus confined within the compass of his own body, the giant intellect? Were Newton, Bacon, Locke—who revelled in the hitherto unexplored depths of the sciences—vain of their personal dress? How utterly absurd is the idea. As much as the mind is superior to the body, so much let it be cultivated and adorned, above the casket which encloses the jewel. Clothing was originally designed simply as a protection from heat and cold. So the simple minded settlers of this country in primitive times, considered it. They attended to their intellects;—and where can be found on the records of history a more sensible, sturdy, pure-minded, interesting class of men? The puritans who landed poor and houseless, on the ice-bound Rock of Plymouth, are a fit and lofty model for the imitation of all future ages.

For ourself, we care not what is thought of the cut of our coat—the shape of our boots—the niceness of our dicky—or the beauty of our stock. If they are liked well;—if not—well.

Our contempt for a coxcomb any where, is strong;—but a dandy at the west is not only despicable, but supremely laughable and ridiculous. Look at that mincing creature in pants, and the et ceteras of his tribe, picking his way, tenderly walking on his toes, through the mud, behind that rough looking, iron-built wolverine;—the one is a clerk with a salary of \$400, the other is a citizen worth \$500,000. The one is thinking of a spot on his snow-white bosom—the other of some mighty discovery in astronomy or mechanism.—Now for whom, dear, gentle, modest reader, do

you feel the most respect? The one, to be sure, has cowhide boots, and a homespun coat—the other wears broad-cloth, cut in the extreme of London fashions.—Will you do homage to mind, or to the covering of the shell in which it is enclosed?

We have commenced a warfare against these insects—for though insects, they are troublesome, like the fly which buzzed round Uncle Toby's nose—and we shall do our utmost to exterminate them.

FROM THE NEW YORK EVENING STAR.  
BIOGRAPHY OF THE KING.

It strikes me that it cannot be out of place, here, to give you a brief sketch of the leading events in the life of the late monarch.

William Henry, third son of George III., was born on August 21, 1765. His childhood presents nothing worthy of notice, except that Mrs. Chapone, the authoress, describes him as being a lively, small, manly child, and fond of fun.

In 1778, he was entered midshipman under the command of Captain Digby, in the Royal George, a 98 gun ship. This was towards the close of the American war. Geo. III. though a very obstinate man, had a fair share of common sense, and determined that his son should work his way up in the navy, the same as any other man's son. He was compelled to rough it, accordingly.

He had not been twelve months in the service, when he had the good luck to be present at the capture of the Caraccas; This was the engagement between Lord Rodney and the Spanish Admiral, Don Juan de Langara. The Spaniard was taken prisoner, and brought on board the Royal George. Here he saw Prince William Henry in his shirt sleeves working away with the other middies, and exclaimed, "well may England be mistress of the ocean, when the son of her king is thus employed in her service."

Subsequently, the Prince was in action at the capture of a French man of war, and three other vessels, and served during most of his time as midshipman in the West Indies, and off Nova Scotia and Canada.

In 1782 he passed the winter in New York. He appears, there, to have become noted as a bold, spirited, gallant youth, with the constitutional courage of his family.

While he was in New York, a bold plan was concocted to carry him off from among his friends and comrades. The devisor of this daring project was Colonel Ogden, a gallant officer in the revolutionary army, and who, with his regiment, was stationed in New Jersey.

At this time the Prince was living on shore, with Admiral Digby, and as no danger was apprehended, their quarters were very slightly guarded. Ogden's plan was to land secretly on a stormy night, with a small and bold band, to capture and carry off the Admiral and the Prince, and to take them to New Jersey. Washington sanctioned the plan, because he thought, if successful, he would the sooner and the better make terms with England for the acknowledgment of American independence.—His directions to Ogden (dated 28th March, 1787) were that no insult or indignity, should be offered to the Admiral or the Prince, and that they should be conveyed to Congress.

The plan was not executed. Sir Henry Clinton got a hint of it, and took care that the guards should be doubled, and every precaution taken for the security of the Admiral and Prince. The plan was thus disappointed.

In 1785, the Prince was made Lieut. The following year, he was appointed Captain of the Pegasus, and in 1790 was made Rear Admiral of the Blue. This last appointment was made by Order in Council.

In May, 1789 he was made Duke of Clarence and St. Andrews, and Earl of Munster. This, it is said, was delayed until he had repeatedly remonstrated with the king, his father, on the delay in giving him a peerage. He swore, in sailor like fashion, that if he could not get a seat in the Lords, he would purchase a seat in the Commons. He had actually lodged the money (20000L) to effect this.

The title of Duke of Clarence had not been held, I believe, since the time when it was held by the gentleman who was drowned in the butt of malmesley. When yet a child he had been nominated to the rank of Knight of the Garter. In 1770, the child (5 years old) was made Knight of the Thistle, being the first member of the royal family who had, except George III, worn that order since it was revived by James II, in 1687.

Although made Rear Admiral, the Duke of Clarence did not get any active command. This galled him amazingly, and he was so piqued that he withdrew from the navy in a great measure.

In 1791, the Duke commenced the well known liaison with the celebrated Mrs. Jordan—it lasted for twenty years. The idea was that she was twenty three years old at the time of its commencement, but there is reason to believe that she was seven years older. She was, however, a very beautiful and fascinating creature, full of life and spirits, the embodiment of hilarity. She had, also, good temper, and it is said during the 25 years of their acquaintance she and the Duke never quarrelled.

The fruits of this intercourse was a large and fine family, the eldest of whom is now Earl of Munster. They all married well—into the first families in the kingdom. Eight children out of ten survive.

The Duke and Mrs. Jordan lived happy together until 1811, when it was suddenly broken up. The cause has been never exactly known. I believe, in truth, the Duke was tired of the *dama*. The woman of 55, was less attractive than the woman of 20. She retired to France, on an allowance of £300 a year, and died in 1816, in poverty, caused by giving blank acceptances to a friend. She was not, however, in absolute want, as has been reported.

In 1811 the Duke was made Admiral of the Fleet, in the place of Sir Peter Parker. In 1814 he hoisted his flag, on being appointed to convey the Count de Provence (Louis XVIII) to France.—Early in 1814 the Duke of Clarence was present *en amateur*, with the British troops at Antwerp, under command of Lord Lyndoch. He was, at the same time, in the midst of the *melee* at Marston.

On the death of the Princess Charlotte, 1817, it was considered politic that there should be a batch of royal marriages "to keep up the stock." The Duke married Adelaide, eldest daughter of the Duke of Saxe Meiningen. The marriage took place at Kew, in July, 1818—two children, who died young, were the only issue.

In 1827 the Duke was made Lord High Admiral of England. In this capacity he gave much satisfaction to the naval service, invariably giving promotion to poor and well meriting officers. But, at the close of 1828, the Duke of Wellington—then Premier—removed him from this situation. It was as Lord High Admiral that the celebrated "Go it Ned" letter to Sir Edward Codrington was said to have been written. The fact is—and this I state on the authority of an autograph communication to myself from Sir Edward; no such epistle ever was written.

The Duke of Clarence, before he was King, mixed very slightly in politics.—He spoke on the Queen's trial, in 1820, and sided with his brother against her.—In 1829 he spoke in favor of Catholic Emancipation.

In June 1830, he became King, and continued the Duke of Wellington in office. At once he became popular—for he shewed himself to and among the people, like George IV, had studiously avoided. He walked, unattended, through various parts of London, and thus gained popularity, which he liked.

In November 1830; the Duke of Wellington's cabinet was broken up. What followed is well known; the appointment of Lord Grey, and the enactment of the Reform Bill. In 1831 the coronation took place, in such an unexpensive manner as compared with that of 1821, that the wits called it a *half coronation*. Shortly after, the King called his bastard son to the peerage, as Earl of Munster, and gave the title and precedence of a Marquis's children to his other illegitimate sons and daughters.

It is said, that, at the same time, he offered an Earldom to Colonel D'Este, son of the Duke of Sussex by Lady Augusta Murray. The parties had been lawfully married at Rome, but Parliament declared it null and void, as contrary to the provisions of the royal marriage act. Colonel D'Este said, "No Sir. I am the legitimate son of my father, and cannot descend to the doubtful situation of *your* sons, by taking the rank you give them. The son of the Duke of Sussex wants no patent of nobility to give him rank!"

In November 1834, the Reform Ministry suddenly went out. The Ministry of Peel followed; broken up in April 1835; and the Whigs again came in, by the aid of O'Connell and "the Tail."

On May 24 the Princess Victoria became of age; 18. The Queen was unable from ill health to take any part in the festivities on this occasion.

Early this month the King was seized with severe illness. It grew worse and worse, and on the 20th inst. all that was mortal of William IV. had ceased.

The character of the late monarch may be summed up in a few words. He was an honest, plain-spoken, blunt man. He always meant well, but he very often acted absurdly. He loved his country, and wished to see men happy around him.

William IV., remained in full possession of all his faculties until the hour of his death. During the last ten days of his illness, he was uneasy if he missed the Queen from his side, and it is a fact that during the whole of that time, so attentive was she, day and night, that she actually had no time to take off her clothes. What rest she took was in a chair by his bedside. They were certainly a model for married people. The King was nearly 20 years older than the Queen.

By an act passed in 1831, the Queen Dowager has a pension of £100,000, and the use of two palaces; Marlborough House, which was the residence of Prince Leopold, and Bushy Park; where, the other palace being much out of repair, she will reside in the summer. Queen Adelaide continues at Windsor Castle, but is preparing to leave it.

King. He took it in his hand and said "Ah, that was a glorious day for England." He turned to Dr. Chambers and said; "you must keep me alive one day more, or the Duke cannot have his Waterloo dinner. You must tinker me up for this one day."

He took no formal leave of his family. They were sent for, when he knew his danger to be immediate, and remained with him until he died.

The Duke of Cambridge, Viceroy of Hanover, was his only relative, except the Princess Victoria, who was not with him during his last illness.

The Dutches of Kent and Princess Victoria did not; it is remarked, send any inquiries to Windsor as to the King's health. Perhaps this was the result of a very intelligent feeling of delicacy on the part of the heiress to the throne.

The King's funeral will take place on July 6. His body has been embalmed, much water was found in the cavity of the chest. During the few last days of his life, the King sat on his couch with his chest resting on an easy chair to mitigate the great pain caused by his severe cough.

A post mortem cast of his face and head has been taken for his children.—His domestics at Windsor were admitted to see his body, which has been deposited in a shell, as decomposition had commenced. The funeral will be almost private, by his own desire.

The public mourning will be general. It commences from this day, by an order from the Lord Chamberlain.

The King signed some necessary documents the day before he died.

Every shop in London was closed out of respect to the late King.

The proclamation of Queen Victoria took place on Wednesday. The Queen arrived at St. James' Palace, and was present, when, with the usual state, this was done. She was led to the window, according to form, and was hailed by the cheers of the multitude. The proclamation took place also in the city of London.

She held a council, and gave numerous audiences; chiefly to official persons.—She then went back to Kensington.

On Thursday evening, a message from the Queen was read in Lords and Commons, requesting them to expedite public business, as there must be a dissolution of Parliament. The oath of allegiance to the Queen is "saving the right of any issue to his late Majesty by his consort, Queen Adelaide." On Tuesday the oath named Queen Alexandrina Victoria, but since then it is Victoria alone, such being her signature.

What her policy may be no one knows. I think it will not be very decided. To Lord Melbourne she appears to have a personal dislike; perhaps on account of the Morton case.

The Duke of Cumberland is now King of Hanover; he swore allegiance to his niece, and took his seat in the Lords. He has left England for Hanover.

Among those of the Commons who have taken the oaths, is Gen. Evans. He was hailed with much applause.

## LUKE MANNING.

We copy the following brief memoir of this notorious murderer from the Alabama Mercury. He was a native of this District, we believe, and some of the crimes narrated in the following memoir are familiar to many of our citizens. He was executed for his last crime at Barbourville, Wilcox County, Ala.—Ed. Columbia Times.

Luke Manning was a native of South Carolina, and his parents are said to have been very respectable and in affluent circumstances. At the age of 17 or 18 he was, by an unfortunate fatality, permitted to select for his associates, during a period of seven or eight years, a parcel of youths of about the same age, whose reckless, dissipated and riotous conduct, rendered them the terror and abhorrence of the neighborhood they infested.

One of the feats he performed during this period, was (for his amusement only,) to seize an old man by the loose skin of his throat, drawing the same from the flesh and inserting his knife close to the windpipe and slitting the skin, leaving a large gash, or to use the peculiar slang of such men, "dew-lapped the man."

At or about this time, (aged 25) he came into possession of his estate, worth about 8000L, equivalent to about \$30,000 at the present day.) He kept bachelor's hall, for he never married, and a gang of his cronies always about him, while at the same time, he attempted the management of his estate. He had not as yet reached that degree of depravity which could enable him to perpetrate the destruction of a fellow being, but to gratify his thirst for blood, he calculated with cool precision, how much of the murderous knife that he constantly carried about him, he might venture to use, without incurring the ultimate penalty of the law. He mechanically broke a gap in the edge of his knife, within an inch of the point, sufficiently large to insert his thumb, and thus provided against wounding his own fingers and any great liability of taking life, he would indiscriminately attack without the smallest justifiable provocation, and cut, lacerate and mark whoever had the misfortune to fall in his way, without superior means of defence. In this manner he left monuments of his cruel and seeming-